•	
-	
₹	
9	
•	
	Ø
)	.≘
	aliforr
•	œ
•	≔
_	ď
=	\circ
3	Ψ_
2	ofC
,	
-	Distric
1	냃
•	∺
_	
2	\subseteq
	~
•	ĕ
₹ .	Ŧ
•	ō
	e Northern 🛘
)	4
	\approx
₹	the
•	≒
)	ıΫ́
í	-
-	

28 ///

1		
2		
3		
4		
5	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
6	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
7		
8	MICHAEL BAIRD, No. C-12-6316 EMC	
9	Plaintiff, ORDER RE DEFENDANT'S OFFER OF	ORDER RE DEFENDANT'S OFFER OF
10	v. PROOF	
11	OFFICE DEPOT,	
12	Defendant.	
13		
14		
15	Previously, the Court granted in part and denied in part Plaintiff's motion for summary	
16	judgment regarding certain affirmative defenses tendered by Defendant. See Docket No. 62 (order)).
17	In the order, the Court dismissed some defenses – including Affirmative Defense No. 3 – because	
18	Defendant had voluntarily withdrawn the defenses, admitting that it had no factual basis for the	
19	defenses at that time. The Court stated that these defenses would be dismissed without prejudice for	r
20	the time being but added that the dismissal would be with prejudice on March 20, 2014 (the expert	
21	discovery deadline) unless Defendant made an offer of proof in support of the defenses by that day.	
22		
23		
24		
25		
26	///	
27	///	

Defendant has now made an offer of proof as to its third affirmative defense $-i.e.$, that
Plaintiff failed to exhaust administrative remedies available to him. See Docket No. 7 (answer).
Having reviewed that offer of proof, the Court vacates its prior order dismissing that defense and
shall allow Defendant to assert that defense in this lawsuit. There is no apparent prejudice to
Plaintiff is the defense is reinstated.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: March 21, 2014

EDWARD M. CHEN United States District Judge